arXiv:1411.1938v2 [math.GM] 10 Dec 2014

Kähler Calculus: Quarks as Idempotents in Solutions with Symmetry of Exterior Systems

José G. Vargas
PST Associates
138 Promontory Rd., Columbia, SC29209
josegvargas@earthlink.net

To the memory of Erich Kähler

Abstract. Symmetry in differential equations constitutes a significant starting point for theoretical arguments. With his Clifford algebra of differential forms, Kähler addresses the overlooked manifestation of symmetry in the solutions themselves of such equations. In "Kähler's algebra", solutions with a given symmetry are members of left ideals generated by corresponding idempotents. These combine with phase factors to take care of all the dependence of the solution on x^i and dx^i for each $\partial/\partial x^i = 0$ symmetry. The maximum number of idempotents (each for a one-parameter group) that can, therefore, go into a solution is the dimensionality n of the space. This number is further limited by non-commutativity of idempotents.

We consider the tensor product of Kähler algebra with tangent Clifford algebra, i.e. of valuedness. It has a commutative subalgebra of "mirror elements", i.e. where the valuedness is dual to the differential form (like in $dx\mathbf{i}$, but not in $dx\mathbf{j}$). It removes the aforementioned limitation in the number of idempotent factors that can simultaneously go into a solution. More importantly, it geometrizes the unit imaginary.

We carry Kähler's treatment over to the aforementioned commutative algebra. Non-commutativity thus ceases to be a limiting factor in the formation of products of idempotents representing each a one-parameter symmetry. The interplay of factors that emerges in the expanded set of such products is inimical to operator theory. For practical reasons, we stop at products involving three one-parameter idempotents —henceforth call ternary— even though the dimensionality of the all important spacetime manifold allows for four of them.

1 Introduction

The present paper is an argument about manifestation of symmetry in solutions of equations, not in the equations themselves. It results from Erich

Kähler's proposed treatment of symmetry of solutions of exterior systems of differential equations. It goes beyond the traditional approach, since phase factors are not enough to deal with this issue. Products of idempotents are required, each of them associated with a corresponding one-parameter group of symmetries. That is a deeper treatment of coexistence of different symmetries in a solution than through the commutativity or not of corresponding operators.

The term exterior system evokes the concept of exterior algebra. Although the term idempotent presupposes a dot product, we have emphasized the dot product in the title to compensate for the fact that the term exterior might indicate its absence and thus cause confusion. As is well known, elements of a Clifford algebra can always be written as sums of interior products. And it is a historical accident that the name exterior system has been used whenever a system of differential equations is written in terms of exterior differential forms.

In section 2, we deal with Kaehler's treatment of translation and rotation symmetry, specifically with their products. But, as relevant because of its potential implications, is Kähler's study of angular momentum and of total angular momentum on idempotents in his algebra of scalar-valued differential forms. We have in mind the potential richness of theoretical results when the same line of argument is carried out with Clifford valued differential forms, which we introduce below. Kähler dealt at length not only with scalar-valuedness but also with tensor valuedness, but it did not have consequence for his treatment of solutions of exterior systems. We do not deal with that topic here, since it would lead us directly into physics, which we avoid in this paper.

In section 3, we consider symmetry related transformations from a perspective of Clifford algebra of scalar-valued differential forms. When the information they provide is taken to the idempotents, the unit imaginary is geometrized. Actually there are many geometric units of square minus one, which automatically increases the number of available idempotents without resort to new symmetries. Tangent algebra valuedness thus makes a natural entrance into the study of solutions with symmetry of exterior systems.

We keep the terminology "Kähler" for whenever the differential forms have a Clifford algebra structure, regardless of their valuedness. In other words, we mean "Kähler" whenever

$$dx^i dx^j + dx^j dx^i = 2\delta^{ij} \text{ or } 2\eta^{ij}, \tag{1}$$

is satisfied.

In section 4, we shall consider Clifford-valued Kähler differential forms., i.e. the coexistence of the Clifford structures defined by (1) and a tangent Clifford algebra of valuedness. The latter is defined by the relation

$$\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j + \mathbf{a}_j\mathbf{a}_i = 2\delta_{ij} \text{ or } 2\eta_{ij}, \tag{2}$$

where η^{ij} is constituted by ones and minus ones, depending on the signature of the metric of the space considered. An appropriate term to refer to its elements would be Clifford-valued clifforms. They belong to the tensor product of the two algebras respectively defined by equations (1) and (2). We shall not, however, use the term clifform, since we shall not be interested in differential forms which are not so.

In section 5, we study the idempotents for the aforementioned symmetries. They live in particular in a commutative algebras contained in that tensor product structure. This change of the game leads to considering products of three of the idempotents for one-parameter symmetries. This greater availability of products is the prelude to a far greater interplay of symmetries.

2 Kaehler's treatment of translation and rotation symmetry

We have brought into this section pertinent results of Kähler's calculus (KC) of scalar-valued differential forms [1], [2] [3]. The last of these publications is a more comprehensive treatment of the first one. Nevertheless, some important results are exclusive to just one of those publications, like his treatment of Lie differentiation [1], his treatment of symmetry in solutions of differential systems [2], and his treatment of total angular momentum [3] (in the sense of linearly combining into one expression all three components of angular momentum). All of these three specific subjects will be reproduced in this section.

2.1 Kaehler's monary and binary solutions with symmetry

Monary idempotents are those belonging to a one-parameter symmetry. By the term binary idempotents, we mean the product of two monary idempotents. A Kähler binary idempotent is constituted by the product of the idempotents for third component of angular momentum and for time translation symmetry. With a view to future physical applications, those idempotents will also be our starting point for the construction of ternary idempotents,

i.e. constituted by the product of three monary idempotents. In the all too important dimension four, it will not make much of a difference in which order we approach the three factors. This will become obvious.

There are two main types of symmetry idempotents, translational and rotational. Of special interest is the interplay between the two types and also the linear coexistence of different one-parameter rotational idempotents within a given equation. Such a coexistence happens in Kähler's work, where total angular momentum, though linear in its components (in a generalized sense of the term) is not a vector operator.

Except for notational changes, Kähler defines the idempotents

$$\epsilon^{\pm} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp i\, dt), \qquad I^{\pm}_{xy} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\, dx\, dy), \tag{3}$$

with $(dx^i)^2 = 1 = -dt^2$ and $c = 1$. The inversion of the signs in the definition of $\epsilon^{\pm}$ has to do with his use of signature. The unit imaginary is there for the purpose of making idempotents. The squares of idt and $i\, dx\, dy$ are $+1$, as required. The squares of dt and $dx\, dy$ are not.

The $\epsilon^{\pm}$ commute with the $I^{\pm}_{xy}$. We also have

$$\epsilon^{+} + \epsilon^{-} = 1 = I^{+}_{xy} + I^{-}_{xy}, \qquad \epsilon^{\pm}\epsilon^{\mp} = I^{\pm}_{xy} I^{\mp}_{xy} = 0. \tag{4}$$

From these equations follows that the statement

$$u = u^{+}\ \epsilon^{+}\ +\ u^{-}\ \epsilon^{-} \tag{5}$$

defines dt-independent *spatial differentials* $u^{\pm}$. Given a spatial differential, u, the statement

$$u =\ {}^{+}u\ I^{+}_{xy} +\ {}^{-}u\ I^{-}_{xy} \tag{6}$$

similarly defines so called *meridian differentials* ${}^{\pm}u$, i.e. that they do not depend on $d\phi$ when written in terms of the basis $(d\rho, d\phi, dz)$. The coefficients in (5)-(6) may still depend on all coordinates.

Combining these definitions and observations, we have

$$1 \equiv \epsilon^{+} I^{+}_{xy} + \epsilon^{+} I^{-}_{xy} + \epsilon^{-} I^{+}_{xy} + \epsilon^{-} I^{-}_{xy}, \tag{7}$$

and, therefore,

$$u \equiv u\epsilon^{+} I^{+}_{xy} + u\epsilon^{+} I^{-}_{xy} + u\epsilon^{-} I^{+}_{xy} + u\epsilon^{-} I^{-}_{xy}. \tag{8}$$

The set of the four idempotents $\epsilon^{\pm} I^{*}_{xy}$ spans the same 4-dimensional module over the complex numbers as the set $(1, dt, dxdy, dtdxdy)$ does. The asterisk means that we may choose for I_{xy} the superscripts $+$ and $-$ independently of the specific superscript in ϵ.

2.2 Of Kaehler's idempotents and commutativity

Idempotents like $\epsilon^{\pm}$ require only a 1−dimensional space. We also need just a one-dimensional space for space translation idempotents. $I^{\pm}_{xy}$ requires at least but not necessarily more than a 2−dimensional space, where we also have $(1/2)(1 \pm i\,dx)$ and $(1/2)(1 \pm i\,dy)$. But the last two ones, when not mutually annulling, do not commute, nor do they commute with the rotational ones (Commutativity will be key in the considerations that follow). In two dimensions, we could also have a (t, x) space, the terminology speaking of the signature of the metric. We will not deal, however, with hyperbolic rotation symmetry, as it will loose relevance when we deal with Lorentzian spaces of dimensions three and four.

The idempotents in (3) would fit in 3−dimensional and 4−dimensional spaces, (t, x, y) and (t, x, y, z). Why did Kähler not consider translations in the x, y and z dimensions in his study of symmetry in spacetime? Once he had to consider $I^{\pm}_{xy}$ in order to deal with rotations for the problem of the fine structure of the hydrogen atom (and also of time translation because of rest mass), there is no room for $(1/2)(1 \pm i\,dx^i)$ since they do not commute with $\epsilon^{\pm}$. And there is no room for $I^{\pm}_{yz}$ and $I^{\pm}_{zx}$ (once $I^{\pm}_{xy}$ has been chosen), since they do not commute with $I^{\pm}_{xy}$.

We proceed to see what role commutativity and the mutually annulling of idempotents exhibited in the last equations (4) play. The impact of commutativity is that it allows for the mutually annulling of idempotents such as, say, $I^{+}_{xy}\epsilon^{-}$ and $I^{-}_{xy}\epsilon^{-}$. Suppose we multiply (7) by $I^{-}_{xy}\epsilon^{-}$ on the right. We get $I^{+}_{xy}\epsilon^{-}I^{-}_{xy}\epsilon^{-} = I^{+}_{xy}I^{-}_{xy}\epsilon^{-}\epsilon^{-} = 0$. If I^{+}_{xy} and ϵ^{-} did not commute, we could not have obtained this result. The impact of the vanishing of three of the four terms annulling when multiplying on the right of (7) by each of the four $\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}$ can be ascertained by trying to make the same considerations with

$$1 \equiv P^{+}_{x}I^{+}_{xy} + P^{+}_{x}I^{-}_{xy} + P^{-}_{x}I^{+}_{xy} + P^{-}_{x}I^{-}_{xy}, \tag{9}$$

and, therefore,

$$u \equiv uP^{+}_{x}I^{+}_{xy} + uP^{+}_{x}I^{-}_{xy} + uP^{-}_{x}I^{+}_{xy} + uP^{-}_{x}I^{-}_{xy}, \tag{10}$$

where $P^{\pm}_{x} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\,dx)$. These are valid equations but the terms on the right of (9) and (10) do not have the same properties as the terms on the right of (7) and (8), which are disjoint, read orthogonal.

The $\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}$ are so call constant differentials [1], [3], meaning $\partial(\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}) = 0$, where ∂ is the sum of the interior (read also divergence and co-derivative)

and exterior derivatives. As a consequence of one of the properties of constant differentials, we have

$$\partial(u\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}) = (\partial u)\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}. \tag{11}$$

Hence all four terms on the right hand side of (8) are solutions of the same equation of the type $\partial u = au$ if u is. The $u\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}$ are mutually orthogonal solutions of the same equation. We are then justified in writing

$$u = {}^{+}u^{+}\, I^{+}_{xy}\epsilon^{+} \;+\; {}^{+}u^{-}\, I^{+}_{xy}\epsilon^{-} \;+\; {}^{-}u^{+}\, I^{-}_{xy}\epsilon^{+} \;+\; {}^{-}u^{-}\, I^{-}_{xy}\epsilon^{-}, \tag{12}$$

with uniquely defined meridian differentials ${}^{\pm}u^{*}$.

One is thus led to seek spinorial solutions that take the form of meridian differentials times $I^{\pm}_{xy}\epsilon^{*}$. In a exterior system, the dependence on t and ϕ of proper functions for time translations and rotational symmetry takes place through the standard phase factors. It is thus *unavoidable* (English translation of the term used by Kähler to make the present point) to consider spinorial solutions of the form

$$u = pe^{im\phi - iEt}\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy} \tag{13}$$

where p is a *strict meridian differential,* i.e. meridian differential whose coefficients depend on ρ and z, but not on ϕ and t.

With a view to future developments, it is worth pointing out at the nature of the different factors in the last expression. The $e^{im\phi - iEt}$ and $\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}$ are structural. On the other hand, p will contain more fleeting info, not further restricted by those symmetry considerations but by the specifics of particular problems. Between $e^{im\phi - iEt}$ on the one hand and $\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}$ on the other hand, the idempotents contain the most rigid factor in (13); in the phase factor, one still has the freedom of having different values for m and E. There is not a comparable freedom in $\epsilon^{\pm}I^{*}_{xy}$.

Let us finally deal with the relation of $\epsilon^{\pm}$ to charge, in addition to energy. In 1962, Kähler derived a conservation law

$$d(u, \eta\bar{u})_1 = 0, \tag{14}$$

from his equation that replaces Dirac's [3]. It is quadratic, in the sense that it is bilinear in u and its complex conjugate, $\bar{u}$. The operator η reverses the sign of differential forms of odd grade, and $(_, _)_1$ is a product of differential forms of grade $n-1$, where n is the dimensionality of the space. We need not enter more details for present purposes. It is well known that equations like this represent conservation laws. What is conserved in this case?

Kähler was able to develop (14) to the point where it acquired the form

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + j + \frac{\partial \rho'}{\partial t} + j' = 0 \tag{15}$$

(Needless to say that ρ and ρ' stand here for charge densities, and j and j' stand for physical currents). Primed and unprimed quantities correspond to the two terms on the right of (5), which associates $\epsilon^{\mp}$ with the two signs of charge, not of energy, which is the same in both cases. The problem of associating particles with antiparticles with opposite sign of energy does not exist in Kähler's work.

2.3 Kaehler's approach to Lie differentiation

We have dealt with the form of solutions with the stated symmetries. We now deal with the related issue of operators for the same symmetries.

In KC, spin emerges through Lie differentiation as an integral part of angular momentum, not as a late attachment to the orbital one. One has to ask oneself, like Kähler did, what is the action of an operator

$$A \equiv \xi_i(x^1, ..., x^n)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \tag{16}$$

on differential forms. It is not what would appear to be at first sight. Suffice to consider the case of definite grade:

$$u \equiv \frac{1}{p!} a_{i_1 ... i_p} dx^{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge dx^{i_p}. \tag{17}$$

The issue thus lies in extending the action of operator (16) from the ring of differential $0-$forms to the ring of differential forms. Kähler ([3], section 16) rightly credits Cartan with such an extension [4]. But the latter's treatment is too cryptic, as he was not interested in providing an expression for the action of the operator. He instead directly derived with a very brief argument the theorem that is sometimes referred to as the golden theorem. It amounts to a different version of that action. Because of its clarity, we now reproduce Kähler's derivation of the formula for Au that he published in [1].

The right hand side of (16) could be viewed as the partial derivative with respect to some coordinate in suitable coordinate systems (y^i). In order to find them, Kähler considers the general solution of the system

$$\frac{dx^i}{dy^n} = \xi^i(x^1, ..., x^n), \tag{18}$$

which one may express as

$$x^i = x^i(y^1, ..., y^n), \tag{19}$$

where the $y^1, ..., y^{n-1}$ are first integrals of (18). The last of the first integrals is additive to the variable y^n, with which we may thus identify it. In the neighborhood of a point, (19) can be viewed as a coordinate transformation. The pull-back of (17) to the y coordinate system is

$$u \equiv \frac{1}{p!} a_{i_1 ... i_p} \frac{\partial x^{i_1}}{\partial y^{k_1}} ... \frac{\partial x^{i_p}}{\partial y^{k_p}} dy^{k_1} \wedge ... \wedge dy^{k_p}. \tag{20}$$

We now compute $\frac{\partial u}{\partial y^n}$ using that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y^n} = \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial y^n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} = \xi^i \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} = A. \tag{21}$$

Notice that, in (18), we had the ξ^i as total derivatives since there was just one independent variable. The same variable is viewed as the last one in a different coordinate system, hence the partial differentiation notation. The derivatives continue to be the same. The result of the computation is

$$Au = \xi^i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^i} + d\xi^i \wedge e_i u. \tag{22}$$

Kähler writes $d\xi^i$ as $d(\xi^i)$ since he reserves the notation $d\xi^i$ for covariant derivatives (See [1], end of his section 17, and second equation in section 34). The non-intuitive implication

$$Au \neq \frac{1}{p!} \xi_i \frac{\partial a_{i_1 ... i_p}}{\partial x^i} dx^{i_1} \wedge ... \wedge dx^{i_p} \tag{23}$$

is due to the fact that what remains constant in partial differentiations changes from term to term in (16). In order to avoid inadvertent errors, one should thus view $\partial / \partial \phi^i$ as the starting point for rotational symmetry with preference over

$$J_i = x^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} - x^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}, \tag{24}$$

Here ϕ^i represents the angle of rotation around three orthonormal axes and (i, j, k) constitute cyclic permutations of $(1, 2, 3)$. Clearly each ϕ plays the role of y^n in the previous argument. Coordinates $y^1, ..., y^{n-1}$ would then be the other coordinates in systems such as those of spherical and cylindrical coordinates, but different systems for different index i in ϕ^i.

2.4 Angular momentum in Kaehler's theory

In terms of Cartesian coordinates, the action of $\partial/\partial\phi^i$ on differential forms is given by

$$J_i u = x^j \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^k} - x^k \frac{\partial u}{\partial x^j} + \frac{1}{2} w_i u - \frac{1}{2} u w_i, \tag{25}$$

where

$$w_i = dx^j dx^k \equiv dx^{jk}. \tag{26}$$

[1], [3]. We shall refer to $\frac{1}{2}w_i u - \frac{1}{2}uw_i$ as the spin term(s), though chirality terms would also be appropriate. These two terms are intrinsically associated, like (we have seen) energy and charge also are.

Notice that, if w_i and u commute, the last two terms in (25) add up to zero. Such u's are proper values of $\frac{1}{2}w_i__ - \frac{1}{2}_w_i$ with proper value zero. The same two terms add up to $w_i u$ if they anticommute. Clearly, w_k commutes with dx^k and $(1/2)(1+w_k)$. It anticommutes with dx^j, dx^k, w_j and w_k, and it neither commutes nor anticommutes with $(1/2)(1+w_i)$ and $(1/2)(1+w_j)$.

Consider now total angular momentum, not just components thereof. Kähler defines an operator K by

$$(K+1)u \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{i=3} J_i u \vee w_i, \tag{27}$$

acting on scalar-valued differential forms u. The reason for Kähler's defining $(K+1)u$ where he could have simply written Ku has the unstated purpose of later ending with the same terminology as in the standard literature. He showed that

$$(K+1)^2 u = \sum_{i=1}^{i=3} J_i^2 u + (K+1)u. \tag{28}$$

If we take the last term to the left side, we get the equation

$$(K+1)Ku = \sum_{i=1}^{i=3} J_i^2 u. \tag{29}$$

It is a relation about operators which has a parallel in a proper values equations in the standard theory of angular momentum. Equation (27) implicitly speaks of J_i as its components, though not in the standard sense of components in a vector space or in a module. The operator

$$K+1 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{i=3} J_{i_} \vee w_i \tag{30}$$

is differential 2−form valued, in the sense that it is the contraction of the J_i with the elements of a basis of differential 2−forms.

The issue of the grade of the operator $K+1$ is a subtle one. We write its components as

$$J_i \equiv= x^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x^k} - x^k \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} + \frac{1}{2} w_i \vee _ - \frac{1}{2} _ \vee w_i, \tag{31}$$

where we have made explicit the symbol for Clifford product. The first two terms on the right of (31) are of grade zero; the last two appear to be of grade two. This is, however, deceiving, as we now explain.

Start by considering that the operator definition (31) follows (25), not the other way around. Given arbitrary differential forms u and v, each of homogeneous grade, the grade of $u \vee v - v \vee u$ is two units less than the sum of the respective grades (see [3], p. 478). By virtue of this, the grade of $J_i u$ and $(K+1)u$ is the same as the grade of u (if of definite grade r) in spite of the fact that each of $\frac{1}{2} w_i u$ and $\frac{1}{2} u w_i$ may consist of terms of grades $r+2$, r and $r-2$.

Notice that, in this treatment of angular momentum, there has not been any need for the unit imaginary. At a certain point, however, it becomes necessary in Kähler's treatment in order to match operators with idempotents and thus with phase factors.

For completeness purposes, we call attention to his remark that the components of angular momentum should be $\frac{h}{2\pi i} J_i$, "and not as is usually the case

$$\frac{h}{2\pi i}\left(J_1 + \frac{1}{2} \quad \vee w_1\right), \quad \frac{h}{2\pi i}\left(J_2 + \frac{1}{2} \quad \vee w_2\right), \quad \frac{h}{2\pi i}\left(J_3 + \frac{1}{2} \quad \vee w_3\right) \tag{32}$$

[3] (section 27). (Compare with [5], chapter 7, Exercise 10).

2.5 Action of angular momentum on rotation idempotents

The action of J_l on w_k and on the idempotents $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i w_k)$ will be the same as the action of $\frac{1}{2} w_l _ - \frac{1}{2} _ w_l$. Obviously

$$J_k I^{\pm}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} w_k \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i w_k) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i w_k) w_k = 0. \tag{33}$$

The idempotents $I^{\pm}_{ij}$ are proper functions of J_k and $\frac{1}{2}(w_k _ - _ w_k)$ with proper value zero. Nothing impedes that spin still be included in the factor $e^{im\phi}$ in (13), through the first two terms in (25). The proper value zero

becomes a pair of opposite proper values for solutions which have $I_{ij}^{\pm}$ as factor and anticommute with the operator J_k. The difference $\frac{1}{2}w_k u - \frac{1}{2}uw_k$ becomes $-uw_k$. Then w_k is absorbed into $(1 \pm iw_k)$. The sign of the proper value will depend on the sign of the action of w_k on $I_{ij}^{\pm}$.

For the other combinations of indices, we first get

$$J_i w_k = w_j, \qquad J_j w_k = -w_i. \tag{34}$$

Then, clearly,

$$J_i I_{ij}^{\pm} = \pm\frac{1}{2} i w_j, \qquad J_i I_{ij}^{\pm} = \mp\frac{1}{2} i w_i. \tag{35}$$

The $I_{ij}^{\pm}$ are not proper "functions" of J_i, J_j, $\frac{1}{2}(w_i __ - __ w_i)$ and $\frac{1}{2}(w_j __ - __ w_j)$.

We use (34) and (33) to obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{i=3} J_l w_1 \vee w_l = 0 + w_3 w_2 - w_2 w_3 = 2 w_3 w_2 = 2 w_1. \tag{36}$$

Thus, in general,

$$(K+1) w_k = 2 w_k. \tag{37}$$

Hence, w_k and iw_k are proper functions of K with proper value $+1$. Finally,

$$(K+1)\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i w_k) = \pm(K+1) i w_k = \pm i w_k. \tag{38}$$

The rotational idempotents are not per se proper functions of K, but can, of course, make part of expressions that are. Let us solve for $K\frac{1}{2}(1 + iw_k)$. We have, using (38),

$$K\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i w_i) = \pm i w_i - \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i w_i) = -\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} i w_i = -\frac{1}{2}(1 \mp i w_i). \tag{39}$$

It thus follows that $-K$ moves $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm iw_i)$ down and up:

$$-K\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i w_i) = \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp i w_i). \tag{40}$$

Notice that the unit imaginary has come into play through the idempotents. It had not done so through the angular momentum operators on their own.

3 Symmetry Related Transformations and the Unit Imaginary

In this section, we shall treat rotations through Clifford algebra, which is the canonical algebra of Euclidean and pseudo-Euclidean spaces. As a by-product, we associate rotational symmetries with gauge transformations. This association can then be extended to other symmetries. All this is relevant for our later replacement of the unit imaginary in the next section. It usurps the role of geometric quantities of square -1.

3.1 Rotation of vectors

The contents of this subsection is well known by every practitioner of Clifford algebra and can be found in one of our posted papers in arXiv [**?**]. We repeat it here for completeness purposes. In the plane, let $\mathbf{t}$ be a unit vector, and let $\mathbf{u}'$ be the reflection of $\mathbf{u}$ with respect to the direction $\mathbf{t}$. We clearly have $\mathbf{u}'\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{t}\mathbf{u}$ because $(\mathbf{u}', \mathbf{t})$ is indistinguishable from $(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u})$ (picture this situation with $\mathbf{u}$ of unit magnitude). Since $\mathbf{t}^{-1} = \mathbf{t}$, we have

$$\mathbf{u}' = \mathbf{t}\mathbf{u}\mathbf{t}^{-1} = \mathbf{t}\mathbf{u}\mathbf{t}. \tag{41}$$

Consider next the reflection of $\mathbf{u}$ with respect to a plane π with normal unit vector $\mathbf{n}$. Let $\mathbf{t}$ now be a unit vector in the direction of the projection of $\mathbf{u}$ on π. The three vectors ($\mathbf{n}$, $\mathbf{t}$ and $\mathbf{u}$) are on the same plane, $\mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{t}$ being perpendicular. By a known elementary theorem, the reflections of $\mathbf{u}$ with respect to two perpendicular vectors are opposite:

$$\mathbf{n}\mathbf{u}\mathbf{n} = -\mathbf{t}\mathbf{u}\mathbf{t}. \tag{42}$$

In 3-D, a rotation of $\mathbf{u}$ by an angle ϕ around an axis in the direction of the unit vector $\mathbf{n}_3$ yields the vector $\mathbf{u}''$ resulting from successive reflections on two planes making an angle $\phi/2$, intersecting along $\mathbf{N}$ and with normal unit vectors $\mathbf{n}_1$ and $\mathbf{n}_2$. We thus have

$$\mathbf{u}'' = \mathbf{n}_2\mathbf{n}_1\mathbf{u}\mathbf{n}_1\mathbf{n}_2 = (\mathbf{n}_1\mathbf{n}_2)^{-1}\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{n}_1\mathbf{n}_2). \tag{43}$$

We write the Clifford product $\mathbf{n}_1\mathbf{n}_2$ in terms of its scalar and exterior components:

$$\mathbf{n}_1\mathbf{n}_2 = \cos\frac{\phi}{2} + \lambda\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2, \tag{44}$$

where $\mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_2$ are any two orthonormal vectors in the plane determined by $\mathbf{n}_1$ and $\mathbf{n}_2$. Clearly then

$$\mathbf{n}_1\mathbf{n}_2 = \cos\frac{\phi}{2} + \sin\frac{\phi}{2}\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2 = e^{\frac{\phi}{2}\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2}, \tag{45}$$

since $(\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2)^2 = -1$. It thus follows that

$$\mathbf{u}'' = e^{-\frac{\phi}{2}\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2}\ \mathbf{u}\ e^{\frac{\phi}{2}\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2}. \tag{46}$$

3.2 (Mainly) rotational and related gauge symmetry

We now extend the action of rotations to elements of the tangent Clifford algebra. We apply it to monomials; the extension to polynomials is trivial. Define

$$\mathbf{R} \equiv e^{\frac{\phi}{2}\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j}. \tag{47}$$

Under a rotation around $\mathbf{a}_k$, the Clifford product of vectors $\mathbf{A} \equiv \mathbf{ab...k}$ becomes

$$\mathbf{A}' \equiv (\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{aR})(\mathbf{R^{-1}bR})...(\mathbf{R^{-1}kR}) = \mathbf{R^{-1}ab...kR} = \mathbf{R^{-1}AR}. \tag{48}$$

Spinors are members of left ideals. Rotational spinors in the tangent algebra are the elements of ideals

$$\mathbf{A}\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j), \tag{49}$$

where $\mathbf{A}$ represents all elements in the algebra. The unit imaginary is there to build the idempotents since $(\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j)^2$ equals -1, and not the required $+1$. Hence something is not quite right with Clifford algebra, as one should not need units imaginary to deal with idempotents in real vector spaces. It looks as if there must be "something Clifford" which is more fundamental than the Clifford algebra itself. We have the solution in the tensor product of two specific, related Clifford algebras. But that is not the only reason why we shall have something more fundamental [1]. More on this in the next section.

Since (49) belongs to the algebra, its rotation in the plane determined by $\mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{a}_j$ is given by

$$\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j)\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{AR}\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j) = \mathbf{A}'\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j), \tag{50}$$

which means that the ideal transforms into itself. But general members of this ideal transform to $\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j)\mathbf{R}$, not to

$$\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{A}\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{a}_i\mathbf{a}_j). \tag{51}$$

Transformation (51) —equivalently ($\mathbf{R^{-1}AR}$, $\mathbf{R^{-1}}\boldsymbol{\psi}$)— is the gauge transformation associated with but not identical to a rotation, even if $\mathbf{R}$ is given by (47).

By virtue of their structure, gauge transformations apply to equations of the type

$$(\partial - \mathbf{A})\boldsymbol{\psi} = \mathbf{0}, \tag{52}$$

where, suffice to say, $\mathbf{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ are respective input and output and where $\mathbf{R}$ might not be as for rotations, (47). The exponent in $\mathbf{R}$ could be, for instance, a scalar times a vector of square $+1$, or i times a vector of square -1. This is so by virtue of the fact that

$$[\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\partial - \mathbf{a})\mathbf{R}]\ \mathbf{R^{-1}}\boldsymbol{\psi} = \mathbf{0} \tag{53}$$

follows from (52) for any operator which has an inverse. Of course, the physical relevance of $\mathbf{R}$ will depend on whether $\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\partial - \mathbf{a})\mathbf{R}$ is an invariant.

Let λ be an arbitrary scalar and let $\mathbf{R}$ be of the type $e^{\lambda\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}^2 = -1$. The idempotents

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{\Sigma}) \tag{54}$$

define ideals

$$\mathbf{A}\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm i\mathbf{\Sigma}) \tag{55}$$

associated with the gauge transformation

$$(\partial - \mathbf{a}) \to \mathbf{R}^{-1}(\partial - \mathbf{a})\mathbf{R}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\psi} \to \mathbf{R}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}. \tag{56}$$

If the two idempotents (54) are associated with solutions of an equation possessing some one-parameter group of classical geometric symmetry, the gauge transformation (56) is associated with that symmetry and we may say that it is a classical gauge symmetry, as opposed to gauge symmetries not directly related to the tangent bundle.

We have seen gauge transformations as invariance properties of equations, (56). If $\mathbf{R}$ is as in (50),the second of these can then be seen as a gauge transformation of the associated ideal, in turn associated with a rotation. Hence the two groups in transformations (56) (rotation groups and spin groups) respond to the same symmetry. Hence, it is correct but not illuminating to speak of two groups. They reflect different applications of the same symmetry.

3.3 Of units imaginary in translational and related gauge symmetry

Assume that Kähler had been concerned with gauge symmetry under space translation. Instead of the $\epsilon^{\pm}$ given in (3), he would have had idempotents like $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm dz)$. Then $\mathbf{R}$ would be $\mathbf{R} \equiv e^{-\lambda \mathbf{a}_3}$. It is not relevant here what $\mathbf{R^{-1}}...\mathbf{R}$ would mean. We have said gauge symmetry under space translation, not space translation symmetry. This difference, which must be clear from the contents of the previous subsection, may be relevant in quantum mechanics. It may be the beginning of a hint of why one has problems with position operators in standard quantum mechanics.

Similarly, we would not have a phase factor for hyperbolic rotation symmetry. The idempotent would be like $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm dtdz)$, and the square of $dtdz$ is plus one.

We shall see in the next section that the right choice of algebra makes the unit imaginary unnecessary for building idempotents or for gauge transformations. We may thus advance that the presence/absence of the standard unit imaginary is a function of the algebra. From this point on in this paper, we shall deal with tangent Clifford algebra valued differential forms. Hence, the gauge symmetries that we shall explicitly or implicitly consider will be of the geometric type, meaning that they pertain to the tangent bundle of vectors, of Clifford elements, of frames, of spinors, etc. These are called tangent, Clifford, frame and spinor bundles in the literature. Here, the term tangent bundle will refer to all of them, in contradistinction to auxiliary bundles.

The natural question then is whether a non-geometric gauge transformation actually is a geometric one that simply has gone unnoticed by an unfortunate choice of algebra. But that is a physical issue, which will thus not be considered in this paper. Let us summarize by saying that there is no need for the standard unit imaginary when one deals with the algebras that shall occupy us in the next section. The issue of the unit imaginary is far more subtle than usually acknowledged. Here is a summary.

4 Clifford-Valued Clifforms

An algebraically minded mathematician who were exposed for the first time to the expression $dx\mathbf{i}+dy\mathbf{j}+dz\mathbf{k}$ might see in there the tensor product of two modules, and/or the tensor product of the two exterior or Clifford algebras spanned by those modules. On the other hand, most of us have been introduced to the wrong concept of (dx,dy,dz) so that $dx\mathbf{i}+dy\mathbf{j}+dz\mathbf{k}$ is a vector

with weird components. It is rather a vector-valued differential form, meaning a vector-valued function of curves. It was already obvious to É. Cartan that one should be dealing with tensor products of structures; he referred to the curvature of Euclidean connections as bivector-valued differential 2-forms [6] (See specially his sections on integral invariants in the chapter on Riemannian manifolds with metric connections of that reference). Both of the structures in his product were exterior algebras. We shall be interested in viewing $dx\mathbf{i}+dy\mathbf{j}+dz\mathbf{k}$ as pertaining to the tensor product of two Clifford algebras.

4.1 Tensor product of Clifford algebras

Exterior and Clifford algebras are quotient algebras of general tensor algebras. Being algebras, they are modules or vector spaces in the first place, of dimension 2^n if constructed upon modules or vector spaces of dimension n. Consider the tensor product of the two Clifford algebras respectively defined by the relations (1) and (2) in terms of orthonormal bases. Simple bases in those algebras are $(1, dx,\ dy,\ dz,\ dydz,\ dzdx,\ dxdy,\ ...)$ and (1, **i**, **j**, **k**, **jk**, **ki**, **ij**, **jk**, ...**)** respectively. The element $dx\mathbf{j}$ of the product structure has components (0, **j**, 0, 0, 0, 0...) in one algebra and $(0, 0, dx, 0, 0, 0, ...)$ in the other. A basis in the product structure is constituted by the $2^n \times 2^n$ elements resulting from product of all the basis elements in one algebra by all the basis elements in the other one.

Each Clifford algebra factor is isomorphic to the structure spanned by the product of $(1, dx,\ dy,\ dz,\ dydz,\ dzdx,\ dxdy,\ ...)$ with (1, 0, 0, ...0). The other Clifford algebra factor is isomorphic to the product of (1, 0, 0, ...0) with (1, **i**, **j**, **k**, **jk**, **ki**, **ij**, **jk**, ...**)**

In the new structures just considered, we have Clifford-valued clifforms, the term clifform being used when the exterior product of differential forms is replaced with their Clifford product. Kähler developed calculus for tensor-valued differentials (clifforms, which he called tensors whose coefficients are differential forms. And he considered physical applications for scalar-valued differential forms, but not for those of more general valuedness. In particular, he did not extend to them his study of symmetry in solutions of exterior systems.

In more recent times, tensor products of Clifford algebras have been considered by Oziewicz [8]. Interestingly, products of similar type have emerged in very deep algebraic work by Helmstetter [9]. Unlike Oziewicz'es and our own work, such tensor products are not per se the primary concepts. In view of the work in this paper, we submit that, "in matters Clifford",

there is something more fundamental than a single Clifford algebra, whether based on equations such as (1) or such as (2).

4.2 Commutative, mirror algebra

The 2^{2n} structure considered in the previous subsection has a subset of mirror-symmetric elements, which give rise to a very interesting structure. We proceed to explain the concept via some simple examples. $dx^1\mathbf{a}_1$ is mirror symmetric and $dx^1\mathbf{a}_2$ is not, since the superscript of one factor is not equal to the subscript of the other factor. But $dxdy\mathbf{ij}$ is mirror symmetric and $dxdy\mathbf{ik}$ is not. Certainly, $d\mathbf{r} \equiv dx\mathbf{i}+dy\mathbf{j}+dz\mathbf{k}$ is a non-monomial example of mirror symmetric element. The inhomogeneous grade element $dx\mathbf{i}+dxdy\mathbf{ij}$ also is. As a member of the structure spanned by (1, **i**, **j**, **k**, **jk**, **ki**, **ij**, **jk**, ...), it has respective coefficients $(0, dx, 0, 0, 0, 0, dxdy, 0, 0, ...)$. And, as a member of the structure spanned by $(1, dx,\ dy,\ dz,\ dydz,\ dzdx,\ dxdy,\ ...)$, it has coefficients (0, **i**, 0, 0, 0, 0, **ij**, $0, 0, ...$). This is to be compared with, say, $dx\mathbf{j}$, whose components in one algebra are $((0, 0, dx, 0, 0, 0, ...)$ and (0, **j**, 0, 0, 0, 0...) in the other (third place versus second place).

What is the motivation for considering the structure of mirror elements, either in itself or as a substructure of the aforementioned tensor product of structures? If the significance of $dx\mathbf{i}+dy\mathbf{j}+dz\mathbf{k}$ were not enough to answer this question, consider rotations and associated gauge transformations. The unit imaginary i in the exponent in standard treatments usurps the role of real geometric units of square minus one in the tangent Clifford algebra of E_3. Thus "i" unduly replaces $\mathbf{a}_1 \wedge \mathbf{a}_2$ ($= \mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2$ by virtue of orthogonality) in the expressions for rotations around the z axis when one uses Clifford algebra [10], [11], [12]. Consequently, the replacement of i with $\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2$ should also take place in the phase factor for third component of angular momentum and in the idempotents for solutions with rotational symmetry. Under such a replacement, elements like $dxdy\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2$ (no sum) emerge in the rotational idempotents.

Let Ω^{lm} be differential 2-forms, say the components $R^{lm}_{pq}dx^p \wedge dx^q$ of the curvature of Euclidean connections as bivectors. The Ω^{lm} are not mirror-symmetric, but the $R^{pq}_{pq}dx^p \wedge dx^q\mathbf{e}_p\wedge\mathbf{e}_q$ are, both with and without summation over p and q (We use $\mathbf{e}$ instead of $\mathbf{a}$ to signify that the bases may be different at different points).

The set of mirror symmetric elements is closed under mirror symmetric products, i.e. with the same symbol in both algebras. $(\wedge, \wedge)$ and $(\cdot, \cdot)$ are mirror products, but not $(\vee, \wedge), (\vee, \cdot), (\wedge, \cdot), (\wedge, \vee)$,etc. The little computa-

tion

$$dy\mathbf{j}(\vee,\vee)dx\mathbf{i} = dydx\mathbf{ji} = (-dxdy)(-\mathbf{ij}) = dxdy\mathbf{ij} \tag{57}$$

exhibits both the meaning of the symbol $(\vee,\vee)$ and the commutativity of this product. This commutativity has nothing to do with the fact that we multiplied monomials. Thus, for example, we have

$$(dx\mathbf{i}+dxdy\mathbf{ij})(\vee,\vee)dxdz\mathbf{ik} \equiv dxdxdz\mathbf{iik}+dxdydxdz\mathbf{ijik} =$$

$$= dz\mathbf{k} + (-dydz)(-\mathbf{jk}) = dz\mathbf{k}+dydz\mathbf{jk} = dxdz\mathbf{ik}(\vee,\vee)(dx\mathbf{i}+dxdy\mathbf{ij}). \tag{58}$$

Coefficients that are not scalar functions do not change the mirror symmetry element property. Thus

$$(\mu dx\mathbf{i}+\nu dxdy\mathbf{ij})(\vee,\vee)\lambda dxdz\mathbf{ik} = \mu\lambda dxdxdz\mathbf{iik}+\nu\lambda dxdydxdz\mathbf{ijik} =$$

$$= \mu\lambda dz\mathbf{k} + \nu\lambda(-dydz)(-\mathbf{jk}) = \mu\lambda dz\mathbf{k}+ \nu\lambda dydz\mathbf{jk}. \tag{59}$$

We have just illustrated that, under mirror-symmetric products, mirror-symmetric elements constitute a commutative algebra. It is a restriction of the aforementioned tensor product of Clifford algebras. The reason is that any minus signs emerging in a product of monomials in one algebra is cancelled by a minus sign from the product of mirror images. The non-symmetric product of mirror symmetric elements is not a mirror symmetric element.

We shall refer with the names mirror symmetric algebra, commutative algebra and commutative subalgebra to the restriction of that tensor product of Clifford algebras to the set of mirror symmetric elements endowed with mirror symmetric multiplication.

Given the element $dx+dxdy$ in the Kähler algebra, it uniquely determines the mirror element $dx\mathbf{i}+dxdy\mathbf{ij}$. For comparison of meanings, we observe that $\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2$ represents any geometric object of unit area in the xy plane of any given Euclidean space. $dxdy$ represents an integrand whose integration gives a number, namely the area of a figure contained in the xy plane. And $dxdy\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2$ represents an integrand whose integration gives a bivector $\lambda\mathbf{a}_1\mathbf{a}_2$, namely any geometric object of area λ in the xy plane of any given Euclidean space with a reference frame attached to it.

4.3 On the foundations of Clifford algebra.

We have developed Clifford-related structure that has not been exploited by the community of Clifford practitioners. One fundamental idea in this

paper is the replacement of tangent Clifford algebra and of Kähler algebra, whether scalar or tensor-valued, by a tangent Clifford algebra valued differential forms. The latter is the tensor product of the tangent Clifford algebra by the Clifford algebra of scalar-valued differential forms. A second fundamental idea is the realization that a commutative algebra lies hidden in that structure when one just considers what we have called mirror symmetric elements, and one restricts their multiplications to mirror-symmetric multiplications. Because of the significance of the implications of these fundamental ideas —product of Clifford structures and multiplication of privileged pairs— they should be considered as pertaining to the foundations of Clifford algebra.

Those two ideas can already be found in Helmstetter [9], though he does not make a claim of having fundamental character. He, however, deals with infinite dimensional vector spaces and his topics (Clifford monoids, Lipschitz monoids and groups and deformations of Clifford algebras) have nothing in common with ours.

In his development of the concept of Clifford monoid, Helmstetter gives the multiplication

$$(x \otimes y) \cdot (x' \otimes y') = \sigma(y, x')\sigma(y, y') \cdot xx' \otimes y'y, \tag{60}$$

where the σ's are just signs ($\pm$) that depend on the arguments (contents of the parentheses) and where (x, y) and (x', y') are members of the tensor product of two copies of the same Clifford algebra. x and y belong to respective copies. But this is a by-product; the pairs (x, y) and (x', y') to which Eq. (60) refers start as privileged pairs of elements of A. The tensor product on the right hand side of (60) is not an hoc multiplication, but implied by an abstract development whose underlying motivation will escape those who, like the present author, lack the required algebraic sophistication. Without need to understand the intricacies of this equation and of the argument that led to it, one may nevertheless see similarities and differences. We mean the likes of the structural similarity of (60) to our tensor product of algebras. until we hit differences like Helmstetter's $xx' \otimes y'y$ versus our own $xx' \otimes yy'$. Beyond that, we would be dealing with differences.

There is a variety of reasons, both mathematical and physical, that have led us in past publications to the structures introduced in this paper. We do not wish to enter them here, as there is reason enough for them in this paper. However, approaching something as meaningful as a commutative algebra from non-commutative ones through tensor product and then restricting both the elements and the products may lack a depth which would

perhaps be achieved by other means. Just for the sake of the example as to the existence of alternative approaches, but without making any claims as to fundamental significance, one could start with elements like ($dx\mathbf{i}$, $dy\mathbf{j}$ and $dz\mathbf{k}$). One would them simply multiply them with a Clifford product. Because of how the structure of what we have called commutative algebra is born (the $dx\mathbf{i}$, $dy\mathbf{j}$ and $dz\mathbf{k}$ being indivisible elements rather than products involving dx and $\mathbf{i}$), there would not be any need to speak of mirror symmetric products of pre-existing elements. If there is fundamental substance to these remarks on our construction, one should assume that there will also be fundamental substance to Helmstetter's work, given the similarities mentioned.

Let us mention another fundamental idea. Recall that a Euclidean space is a special case of affine space, which in turn is a particular case of projective space, in turn of ..., in turn of topological space, in turn of ... and in turn of set (Fill the blanks as per your understanding). Ideally, algebraic concepts at one of those levels (say Clifford algebra at the Euclidean and pseudo-Euclidean levels) should mimic algebraic concepts of more general levels. This point has been made very explicitly by Barnabei, Brini and the late Professor Rota [13] in connection with the work of Peano [14] on the algebra which is to projective space what Clifford algebra is to Euclidean space. Grossly speaking, they make the point that basic products in projective algebra should mimic operations in set theory like those of reunion and intersection. Such conceptual prolongation is already present, though in less overreaching way, in É. Cartan's view of the theory of Euclidean connections as theory of affine connections where affine tangent bundles are restricted to Euclidean tangent bundles [6].

There is in Barnabei et al's work the attempt to look at mathematics from a perspective of unification of conceptual spaces. We find such attempts very laudable. At the level of trying to find such unifications, or at least mentioning their potential existence, the issue of whether we are dealing with finite or infinite spaces will certainly have consequences, but these may come in the wash of developing the hypothetical unified picture.

4.4 Action of angular momentum on the mirror algebra of 3-D Euclidean space

Of special significance is the action of angular momentum on rotational idempotents in the mirror algebra.

Define

$$\mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} \equiv \pm\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}). \tag{61}$$

Instead of (33) and (35) we now have

$$J_l \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \pm \frac{1}{2} J_l w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}, \tag{62}$$

where $\mathbf{a}_{ij}$ is compact notation for $\mathbf{a}_i \wedge \mathbf{a}_j$ (equal to $\mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j$ by virtue of orthonormality). Hence

$$J_i \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \pm \frac{1}{2} w_j \mathbf{a}_{ij}, \qquad J_j \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \mp \frac{1}{2} w_i \mathbf{a}_{ij}, \qquad J_k \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = 0, \tag{63}$$

and, therefore,

$$(K+1) \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \pm \frac{1}{2} (K+1) w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}, \tag{64}$$

since the action of $(K+1)$ on $1/2$ is zero.

We proceed to develop $(K+1)\mathbf{I}_{12}^{\pm}$ and generalize by means of cyclic permutations. Thus

$$(K+1) \mathbf{I}_{12}^{\pm} = \pm \frac{1}{2} \sum_l (J_l w_3 \mathbf{a}_{12}) w_l = \pm \frac{1}{2} (w_2 w_1 - w_1 w_2) \mathbf{a}_{12} = \pm w_3 \mathbf{a}_{12}, \tag{65}$$

and, therefore,

$$(K+1) \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \pm w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}. \tag{66}$$

The action of K itself on $\mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm}$ is of interest:

$$K \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \pm w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij} - \frac{1}{2} (1 \pm w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}) = -\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij} = -\mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\mp}. \tag{67}$$

Hence,

$$-K \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\mp}, \qquad K^2 \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm} = \mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm}. \tag{68}$$

We see that the rotational idempotents, $\mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm}$, are not proper functions of either K or $K+1$. The $w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}$ are:

$$(K+1) w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij} = 2 w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}, \qquad K w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij} = w_k \mathbf{a}_{ij}. \tag{69}$$

For later purposes, we proceed to consider proper values of elements of different grades in a Cartesian basis of differential 1−forms and 2−forms. Let $d\mathbf{x}^i$ denote $dx^i \mathbf{a}_i$ (no sum). We have

$$J_i d\mathbf{x}^1 = (0,\ dx^3, -dx^2) \mathbf{a}_1 \tag{70}$$

and

$$(K+1) d\mathbf{x}^1 = \sum (J_i d\mathbf{x}^1) w^i = (dx^3 w_2 - dx^2 w_3) \mathbf{a}_1 = 2 dx^1 \mathbf{a}_1 = 2 d\mathbf{x}^1, \tag{71}$$

and similarly for other values of the index. Hence

$$K d\mathbf{x}^l = d\mathbf{x}^l. \tag{72}$$

On the other hand

$$(K+1) dx^{ij}\mathbf{a}_{ij} = 2dx^{ij}\mathbf{a}_{ij}, \tag{73}$$

and, therefore,

$$K dx^{ij}\mathbf{a}_{ij} = dx^{ij}\mathbf{a}_{ij}. \tag{74}$$

It follows that the proper values of $(K+1)$ are always $+1$ for all members in the module of mirror $1-$forms and mirror $2-$forms. They are zero for $0-$forms and mirror $3-$forms (Like scalars, w commutes with the whole algebra). The action of $K+1$ on it is, therefore, zero.

5 Idempotents in Commutative Algebra

5.1 Hierarchy of products of idempotents in commutative algebra

In the previous section, we introduced the three pairs of rotational idempotents $\mathbf{I}_{ij}^{\pm}$ (i.e. $\pm\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm w_k\mathbf{a}_{ij})$). Although commutativity is no longer a problem, once we have one of those pairs there is no room for the other two in a product.

In a way similar to our definition of rotational idempotents in the commutative algebra, we now define time and space translation symmetries. Instead of the first equations 3, we now have, for the first of those two,

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp dt\mathbf{e}_0) \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp d\mathbf{t}), \tag{75}$$

with $d\mathbf{t} \equiv dt\mathbf{e}_0$.

Space-translational symmetry is different, in that the phase factor is not of the standard type, since the square of $\mathbf{a}_i$ is not minus one. For this reason, time translational symmetry has pre-eminence over it.

Commutativity enters the concept of primitiveness. Since it is present everywhere in this algebra, it is no longer a significant concept. The replacement $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm dz\mathbf{a}_3)$ for the idempotents $\frac{1}{2}(1 \pm idz)$ will now have a role to play. As we did with the rotational idempotents, we shall consider all three directions,

$$\mathbf{P}_i^{\pm} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm d\mathbf{x}^i), \tag{76}$$

with $d\mathbf{x}^i \equiv dx^i\mathbf{a}_i$.

All these idempotents will have to be accompanied by corresponding geometric phase factors,

$$e^{m\phi \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_j} \mathbf{I}^{\pm}_{ij}, \qquad e^{-E\tau \mathbf{a}_0 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}} \qquad e^{\lambda_i x^i \mathbf{a}_i} \mathbf{P}^{\pm}_i, \qquad \text{no sums!} \tag{77}$$

We might think of proceeding with $d\rho$ as we have done with dz. We do not see a reason at this point to do so in dealing with ternary idempotents. From a physical perspective, "$d\rho$ translational symmetry" is unheard of. From a mathematical perspective, dz and the corresponding idempotent are constant differentials; $d\rho$ and its associated idempotents are not. Also, the metric of Euclidean space depends on ρ when written in cylindrical coordinates (We have to use these coordinates if rotational symmetry is assumed in the first place).

Needless to say that $\mathbf{I}^{\pm}_{ij}\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_k$ may be expected to play a more significant role than $\mathbf{I}^{\pm}_{ij}\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_i$ and $\mathbf{I}^{\pm}_{ij}\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_j$. Similarly, in dealing with applications, products involving $\mathbf{I}^{\pm}_{ij}$'s and/or $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}$'s will be more significant than products involving $\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_i$'s because of the inadequacy of the corresponding exponential factors as phase factors.

Hence, we have been able to justify consideration of a set of idempotents for symmetry which goes far beyond the set of Kähler's four binary idempotents for dealing with the electromagnetic interaction.

We have not yet considered boosts. There are physical reasons for not doing so, but this is not the place to deal with such reasons. Let us deal with the mathematical arguments. Recall that, in dimension four, we had at our disposal ρ and z —but not on ϕ and t— once joined time translational and rotational symmetry had been assumed. There is no room to accommodate any boost under such restrictions. One might retort that there is no room either for translations along the x and y axes. But there is an important distinction between boosts and translations, the implications of this difference to be considered in a future paper. Let us give a hint. Although there is no room for solutions of field equations with translational symmetry in directions contained in the plane of rotations, there still is room for them in connection with particles, specifically when describing curves. Indeed curves satisfy the "natural lifting conditions" $dx^i - u^i dt = 0$. So, dx^i is just a multiple of dt (or of $d\tau$). Nothing similar takes place with the differentials $dx^i dt$ that pertain to boosts like the $dx^i dx^j$'s pertain to rotations.

We are thus led to view the ternary idempotents

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}\mathbf{I}^{\pm}_{ij}\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_m \tag{78}$$

as candidates for physical applications in the same way as Kähler considered

$\epsilon^{\pm} I^*_{xy}$ for applications in relativistic quantum mechanics. We shall refer to (78) as the canonical ternary idempotents of 4-D Lorentzian space.

5.2 Canonical ternary idempotents of 4-D Lorentzian space

In connection with (78), there are two issues to be considered. One of them is that some of those are repeated. The other one is that, after removing repetitions, there still are linear combinations of them that add to zero. We shall deal only with the first of these issues, since dealing with the second one would have too much of a physics flavor. That is purposefully avoided to avoid conflicts of classification in the arXiv.

Consider the following equalities:

$$4\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{1} = (1 + d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y})(1 \pm d\mathbf{x}) = (1 + d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y})(1 \pm d\mathbf{y}) = 4\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{2}. \tag{79}$$

$$4\mathbf{I}^{-}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{1} = (1 - d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y})(1 \pm d\mathbf{x}) = (1 - d\mathbf{x}d\mathbf{y})(1 \mp d\mathbf{y}) = 4\mathbf{I}^{-}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{\mp}_{2}. \tag{80}$$

Notice the change of sign in the exponent of (80), which is not the case in the exponent of (79). At the level of solutions of equations and not just idempotents, there would still be a difference in the phase factors.

Multiplication of $\mathbf{I}_{12}$ with $\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{3}$ will not be in the same footing with multiplication with $\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{2}$, since z (thus $\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{3}$) relates to $\mathbf{I}_{12}$ in a different way than to $\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{P}^{\pm}_{2}$. In the case of $\mathbf{P}_3$, we have a different symmetry if the plus and minus directions are indistinguishable. In that case, $\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{+}_{3}$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{I}^{-}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{-}_{3}$, and $\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{-}_{3}$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{I}^{-}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{+}_{3}$ (There are subtleties involved in this which should be taken into account in applications where more than idempotent would be involved. Again, we stay out of this since we would be entering physics.

In view of these symmetries, we can organize the six different $\mathbf{I}_{12}\mathbf{P}$ binary idempotents in three columns and two rows respectively for the subscripts and superscripts of $\mathbf{P}$. We left-multiply them by $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}$. We thus have the following table of twelve different canonical ternary idempotents

$$\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{+}_{1} & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}\mathbf{I}^{-}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{+}_{2} & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{+}_{3} \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{-}_{1} & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}\mathbf{I}^{-}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{-}_{2} & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\pm}\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}\mathbf{P}^{-}_{3} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{81}$$

We could also have organized the same group of idempotents with $\mathbf{I}^{-}_{12}$ in columns 1 and 3, and $\mathbf{I}^{+}_{12}$ in column 2, everything else remaining the same. Other options would involve physical considerations.

What we have done for $\mathbf{I}_{12}$ can be repeated for $\mathbf{I}_{23}$ and $\mathbf{I}_{31}$. In these cases, the role of $\mathbf{P}_3$ in (81) would be played by $\mathbf{P}_1$ and $\mathbf{P}_2$ respectively. Putting these options together yields a set of 36 different ternary idempotents. They

cannot be linearly independent since the dimension of the commutative algebra is 16. We shall not enter into that since the results would look very much like physics, and we intentionally want to let this paper be of a purely mathematical nature.

6 Concluding Remarks

Among the many results obtained in this paper we mention those that constitute its core. Kähler's idempotents for solutions with symmetry contain the unit imaginary. We have reformulated them so that their now geometric form allows for the removal of that unit. It happens in a commutative algebra embedded in the tensor product of Kähler's real algebra of scalar-valued differential forms with its dual Clifford algebra of valuedness (i.e. tangent Clifford algebra). More importantly, Kähler's focus on solutions of equations rather than on the equations themselves allows one to extend the manifestation of symmetry through a greater set of more sophisticated idempotents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Conversations with Professors Oziewicz and Helmstetter are acknowledged. Generous funding from PST Associates is deeply appreciated.

References

[1] Kähler, E.: Innerer und äuserer Differentialkalkül. Abh. Dtsch. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Kl. Math. Phys. Tech. **4**, 1-32 (1960).

[2] Kähler, E.: Die Dirac Gleichung. Abh. Dtsch. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Kl. Math. Phys. Tech. **1**, 1-38 (1961)

[3] Kähler, E.: Der innere Differentialkalkül. Rendiconti di Matematica **21**, 425-523 (1962).

[4] Cartan, J. É.: Leçons sur les invariants integraux, Hermann, Paris (1922).

[5] Gilmore, R.: Lie Groups, Lie Algebras and Some of Their Applications, Dover, Mineola (N.Y.), (2002).

[6] Cartan, J. É.: Sur les variétés à connexion affine et la théorie de la relativité généralisée, *Ann. Ec. Norm.* **40,** 325-412 (1923).

[7] Vargas, J. G.: Real "Units Imaginary" in Kähler's Quantum Mechanics, arXiv: 1207.5718v1[physics.gen-ph] 18 Jul 2012.

[8] Oziewicz, Z.: From Grassmann to Clifford, J. S. R. Chisholm and A. K. Common (eds.). Clifford Algebras and Their Applications in Mathematical Physics, Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht (1986).

[9] Helmstetter, J.: Monoides de Clifford et deformations d'algebres de Clifford, Journal of Algebra **111**, 14-48 (1987)

[10] Casanova, G.: L'algèbre vectorielle, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris (1976).

[11] Lounesto, P.: Clifford Algebras and Spinors, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2001).

[12] Snygg, J.: A New Approach to Differential Geometry using Clifford's Geometric Algebra, Birkhäuse, N.Y. (2012).

[13] Barnabei, M., Brini, A. and Rota, G-C.: On the Exterior Calculus of Invariant Theory, Journal of Algebra **96**, 120-160 (1985)

[14] Peano, O.: Calcolo geometrico secondo l'Ausdehnunglehre di H. Grassmann, Fratelli Bocca Editori , Torino, 1888.